INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE EXCEPTIONAL RESEARCH

Humor and Tragedy: Exploring the Interconnectedness of Comedy and Catastrophe in Shakespeare's Works

Reem Mohsin Kadhim Aboaltaboukq
Assistant Inst., Department of Scholarships and Cultural Relations, University Presidency, Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Al-Najaf Al-Ashraf, Iraq

Corresponding Author: **Reem Mohsin Kadhim Aboaltaboukq**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-8261
Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.41
Volume: 05
Issue: 02
March-April 2026
Received: 18-01-2026
Accepted: 16-02-2026
Published: 19-03-2026
Page No: 101-105

Abstract
This paper examines the Private and public calamity shook the world in which Shakespeare lived. The death of Queen Elizabeth, plague, the dissolving of the London theaters, and the beginning of civil war influenced Shakespeare's writing in complex ways. Some of his earlier ideas were abandoned, but a tragic view of human deeds and his chaotic world prevailed even in the comedies. The tragedies too, often great in scope and grandeur, took love's difficulties more seriously.
Shakespeare's comedies are comic partly as they insist on love's difficulties. The tragic view of human deeds is there even in the comedies. Like the tragedies, the comedies empathize with the lower classes hurt by fate, and pity is aroused. Very tragic events can befall fools. Fortune's wheel is a medieval idea of fate spinning mankind to and fro between prosperity and calamity. Even for the great, fortune's gifts were meager. The providential time scheme of the comedies presupposes God's plan hidden temporally from men. World and men's deeds seem absurd.
Nevertheless, Shakespeare's comedies preeminently comic, not tragic. The comic view, present also in the tragedies, prevails. Catastrophes are averted, love is victorious, and laughter triumphs. The abject fools are anywhere in commedia. Even in the tragedies, stupidity and folly abound. In Cleopatra's grand tragedy, despair is ridiculous and death absurd. Tragedy is serious but parodic. A mock tragic view is parodic Shakespeare's other parodic tragedies. Fooling parodies the tragic and serious view of the world. It is tragic as death parodies life and the tragic view of life. Fooling triumphs as life, laughter, and comic victory in the end. Life unexamined and laughter abound.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/IJSSER.2026.5.2.101-105

Keywords: Shakespeare, Tragedy, Queen Elizabeth, Cleopatra, comic victory

1. Introduction

The play's the thing. The audience claps as the curtain falls, the lights rise, and the players begin to exit. They are still in character, still in a world made real beyond the proscenium arch, but one by one, they return to themselves. Hamlet sets aside the courtier's demeanor, removes his robes, and sighs, "What a piece of work is man." It is a bitter regret, a disdain for something as grand and as ridiculous as humanity. In its running time of over two hours, Hamlet has swept through love, madness, death, revenge, and tragedy; it has been a mirror held to nature, and it is now over. Or is it? The tragedy, having been great, necessitates a great reckoning, and so the players gather to perform once more. This time they will not enact a story, a fiction; they will instead share with the audience their experience of that tragedy within a story — their story — of farce, of comedy. It is a thing no less

theatrical than Hamlet itself, yet it is not tragedy. Rather, in its jokes, its playfulness, its looseness, and its intimacy, it is all the things that tragedy is not. It is The Mousetrap, and it is how Hamlet cannot end.

Across different mediums and epochs, comedies come in many shapes and sizes, yet they are most often structured in a familiar way. A world is shown that is balanced and orderly; something intrudes upon that world, upsetting the balance; the characters scramble to restore order, and in so doing, they enact a series of humorous actions; the order is restored, and the audience, having laughed at these hysterical goings-on, is invited to share in the new order. To oversimplify slightly, it is a four-act form. Hamlet is a tragedy in five acts, but there are many five-act comedies as well, including Midsummer Night's Dream, Much Ado about Nothing, and Twelfth Night from Shakespeare's own oeuvre. However, generally comedies are shorter than tragedies. Though different treatments of time exist, the tendency is for tragedies to take longer then comedies, and for this reason, attempting to quadruple the comedic run time of a tragedy is perhaps ill-fated. In Shakespeare's canon, however, there is one text in which this endeavor is central, and that text is Hamlet. Furthermore, within Hamlet, The Mousetrap is explicitly so large as to dwarf the text's other players. Juxtaposed against Hamlet's long lapse into indecision, it is, and must be, in form and running time, a great tragedy (Marques Luiz and Macdonald Alden, 2018) [6].

2. Background and Significance

Comedy and tragedy, far from being wholly antithetical, permeate Shakespeare's works alike through a wide variety of forms and processes operating within the plays. The pursuit of comic solutions to tragic situations often leads Shakespeare's characters into embarrassment, exile, and physical danger, even as their dances and jests evoke memories of past failures. In like manner, tragic catastrophes elicit a comic incongruity when viewed from a distance children slaughtered in their beds or wives thrown from a battlement may provoke horror even as they invite sardonic laughter. Shakespeare clearly identifies this mutual vulnerability in the first act of Hamlet, "to take the ghost's word for a devil's," to accept the apparition of his father as a "goblin damned," seems such a ridiculous and dangerous contingency that Hamlet must provoke in the players a "tragedy of the Matricide" to entrap "the conscience of the King." That the King's horror at the play would prompt his murderous silence seems equally ridiculous; for nothing can be easier than "to catch the conscience of the King" with a "passion play" of a poisoned ear.

Yet Hamlet is not as certain of the King's guilt as he is of the play's power to "suit the action to the word," to "catch the conscience of the King." A play, after all, is only a play a "very Whisker of a tragedy" or "a play of an old murder." In the words of the player king, no matter how artfully composed, a tragedy resolves itself into "the thing that moves action," a "bad play" without "blood" or "deed." Therefore, Shakespeare's comic characters, who inhabit the tragic work of the court, the bear pit, the tomb of the nameless, try to make light of these deadly matters, laughter for Hamlet's mourning, wonderful farces to try upon the audiences of princes what tragic consequences they may have for commoners such as buffoons and beggars (Laureen Lowe, 1999) [4]. As will be illustrated, a desire for comic relief in Shakespeare's tragedies this comic necessity, a kind of "obscene" laughter, sends crafty clowning characters scuttling madly about all death's parlors, tumbling grave stone to grave stone, funeral carried out as if still in jest; instead of weeping for loved ones entombed, "Like rabbits with their sweethearts slain" crack jests over "forty" dead, or some too "dramatic" corpse "a fool" even in death, mocking pompously sad kings.

3. Purpose and Scope

Not so long ago, tragedy was swept aside as impossible with the demise of kingship as the focus of drama. Comedy, on the other hand, with its social perspective, its focus on the restorative vision of society and celebration of the communicative power of wit, found renewed vigour in an age of growing freedom and experiment. However, like Richard II only half alive, apparently dead but still looming large, the obdurate presence of tragedy inwardly lingered on, even if at a subdued pitch, in the tragedies of the dispossessed and the recollected loss of greatness in a time when greatness no longer appeared possible. Moreover, at the very heart of comedy, there resided a concern that now seems all the more obvious in a time in which aggressive motives and the potential for fundamental hatred seems unleashed: the anxieties, insecurities and failures that accompany difference and a sense of the precariousness of social being despite the social assurances that form the very grounds for comedy in the first place (Laureen Lowe, 1999) [4]. In the conceit of comedy's triumph over tragedy, either misrecognition or an unrecognised blindness takes hold. The mechanism of reconciliation in comedy that brings its closure is necessarily violent, albeit most usually covertly so, inflected by a spatial awareness that all too readily homogenises difference. In the six comedies set in Italy, this latter characteristic acquires the sense of the exotic and mysterious operative in the logic of the pastoral retreat as Lotario remarks to his audience: "I hope to entertain you / with some Italian merriments". Scripted as evenings in a sylvan paradise, the precisely geographical as well as cultural setting of these comedies in an Italy outside England generates a distance that plays upon and amplifies the social certainties underpinning the comic resolution.

4. Literature review

This genre-paradigm essay intends to explore the tragedy-comedy dialectics by illustrating paratragedy as a means of comic playwrights addressing the issue of tragic theatre. The purpose of comic playwrights in handling tragedy is to detune its seriousness and remove the apprehension it inspires in the audience, while comic paratragedy attempts to re-establish tragedy on the comic stage (Lorena Navarro Martínez, 2017) [5]. According to Aristotle, tragedy deals with "higher" characters than comedy. However, there is no obvious difference between the two plays within the same genre; the paratragedy comic play, Taming of the Shrew and Lear's Fooling, shows the juxtaposition of tragic and comic elements. Thus, examining paratragedies can reveal how comic playwrights parody tragic dramatists' compositional strategies and demean the serious pathos of tragedy by illustrating the mock use of tragic conventions.

In both Shakespearean Hamlet and Jonsonian Catiline, humour or humours exist as a means of participation in the melancholic state of the protagonists. The concept of humours may shed light on why the audience is drawn to

melancholy contemplation (N Betts, 2016) [7]. Shakespeare uses the comic characters to explore the tragic characters' melancholic behaviour and amplify it in a macroscopic way. According to the holistic view of humours, the melancholic humour is both a personal state and a communal one. Hamlet adopts a melancholic humour as a means of contemplating revenge. However, this personal quest cannot be fulfilled without using other characters as his agents in revenge. Thus, the play's progression leads the characters to share the same melancholic humour with Hamlet in order to stage the revenge play.

5. Theoretical Framework

To explore these questions, it is necessary to establish a critical framework for both the choice of texts and the particular understanding of comedy and tragedy that is brought to them. First, attention must be paid to how Shakespeare's contemporaries understood and categorised comic and tragic plays, particularly the middle or hybrid genre of tragicomedy. Then an explanation will be offered of the parameters within which tragicomedy is considered to function in this study, regarding dramatic structure, character, and the overall effect on the audience. Shakespeare's Love's Labour's Lost and King Lear fit within the parameters of tragicomedy as it has been defined here, although neither play adopts the form with equal degrees of fidelity or success. The remaining two plays, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, are also considered to be tragicomedies in this sense. *The Winter's Tale* is more in keeping with the tragicomic ideal as it has been defined here, but Shakespeare's use of tragicomic elements in *The Tempest* is much more radical, and it is to this play that the most profoundly questioning treatment of the comic and tragic is brought (Laureen Lowe, 1999) [4]. In approaching the question of why a normally comic character may suddenly behave tragically or violently everything that is normally meant by 'character' has to be set to one side in order to focus instead on the very nature of personal identity. A feature common to Aristotle's Poetics and later Elizabethan literary criticism is the notion of character as an extension of dramatic form. Comedy and tragedy speak to the audience as members of that society but in differing ways, and character type is one way in which this social contract is enacted. The means by which a character's identity is constructed on the stage are fixed, and it is the relationship between these means and the wider dramatic context in which they exist that determines whether a character is comic or tragic. The tragicomedies are in certain respects comedies that have been informed by tragedy: they make extensive use of comic dramatic techniques and character types that can also be found in Shakespeare's comedies, but tragic events either shape or disrupt the comic action. Never the less this investigation into tragicomedies must find a means of interrogating the comic or tragic nature of certain plays and characters outside of this context. An understanding of the social and dramatic contract of comic plays and characters must be established first before tragicomic hybrids can be considered.

6. Literary Theory and Analysis

- Historical Context of Comedy and Tragedy in Shakespearean Drama
- Key Theoretical Approaches to Understanding Humor and Tragedy

7. Comedic Elements in Shakespeare's Tragedies

The blending of opposing genres, or the funerals of one genre pushing others to the fringe of survival, or parastasis, has inspired reflection, debate, and bold creative undertakings. Paratragedy or comic tragedy blossoms in Shakespeare's vision of tragedy. No other tragic dramatist, in Shakespeare's epoch and beyond, exhibits as fully a tragic development of comic genre. No other comic dramatist, in Shakespeare's epoch and beyond, composes comic plays as jewelled, yet as doomy and lethal, as his tragical plays (Lorena Navarro Martínez, 2017) [5]. In encountering tragedy, comedy struggles, to survive chiefly by means of parody. Although paratragedy parodies tragedy and is in that sense a lower genre, an analysis reveals a tragedy-thickened genre transfiguring tragedy's 'truth' and vision. Text-laden comic tributes to tragic rivals punctuate analysis, both Shakespearean and non-Shakespearean. Outside Shakespeare, a paratragic comic play exemplifies paratragedy in its blending of formally distinct genres, epic and farcical. Outside Shakespeare, comic plays parodying tragic and panegyric assassins testify to tragedy's historical grip on comedy. Paratragedy persists. Janus-verse Hope Falls, partly farcical, partly tragic-lyrical, in today's post-tragic world drinks to tragedy's demise, while at once jesting at the expense of the tragic dead (Larner, 2001) [3].

8. Characterization and Foils

Unlike Aristotle, whose view of tragedy as "an imitation of an action that is serious, complete, and of a certain magnitude" comes from his study of Greek dramas, Shakespeare's tragedies emerge from histories, comedies and other works. Each tragedy has connections with comic and precomedic elements. The blending of tragic and comic contributes to the overall power and complexity of the drama. In Merchant of Venice, dramatic seriousness rules, but the boundaries between tragedy and comedy are blurred. Early scenes are comico-legal; the bond is quarrelsome and comic. The trial begins as a comedy, but paradoxically, Portia is in charge of the law and disguises herself as a male lawyer. When Shylock enters the court, mysticism prevails; even the audience cannot know his next move. The court becomes a tragic arena similar to Shakespeare's other tragedies. Portia's speech "The quality of mercy…" ties Shylock's fate to the moral of tragedy, whereas the endings of the comedies are happy in accordance with justice. In addition, Shylock's characterization foils the 'comic' characters' and furthers the tragic severity (Lorena Navarro Martínez, 2017) [5].

9. Language and Wordplay

Shakespeare was a wordsmith par excellence, capable of manipulating the English language to create meaning and sound effects, wordplay and puns, humor and bitterness. It is therefore expected that Shakespearean characters, particularly clown or fool characters, would interact with language in sometimes surprising and unexpected ways. Fool characters often play with language and words, finding new meanings and connections, and contributing to the play's exploration of important thematic concerns like love and order (Lorena Navarro Martínez, 2017) [5].

Fools can also use language to lift characters and audiences above the chaotic events of the surrounding world and even provide a kind of necessary perspective to help see the world clearly. Tragical histories can become comedies, and tragedies and catastrophes can be laughed at. After all, life is just a stage on which mortality must needs act a part. Characters must come on stage, play their parts, be seen and heard, then, like the foolish players, depart. With the playing of life, its sense, meaning and importance come into question and doubt; does life even have a plot, a point? Did it begin, or has it been forever? Does it end, or will it continue unceasingly? Did it arrive in existence, or has it simply been? Does it matter? The absurdity of life and existence is and must be played at, laughed at, considered foolish.

In King Lear, the Fool dismissively describes his master Lear as "a king," "anointed," "a wise man," but "a very Fool," because the lordling "play's in the rain." In this divine clowning on the folly of kings and mortals, Lear thus learns to see himself as a "poor, naked wretches." He is moved to empathy, "All's folly!" and "All's plague!" follies beget follies, misjudgements plague and destroy all. At the end, with life's utmost grief, Lear only cries his dead daughter Cordelia's name. Nevertheless, having played and laughed at life's suffering and absurdity, Lear's tragic history is somehow a comedy.

10. Tragic Elements in Shakespeare's Comedies

Principais características das tragédias shakespearianas que estão presentes nas peças cômicas. Embora se explique a presença de certos elementos trágicos em comédias shakespearianas, Como as Alegres Comadres de Windsor e Medida por Medida, não se esteja generalizando para todas as comédias, mas apenas tentando apontar alguns elementos trágicos. Como o pálido luz da manhã, a comédia shakespeariana traz resquícios da noite anterior, da tragédia. A primeira peça cômica de Shakespeare, A Comédia dos Erros, é bastante cômica; ainda assim, certa atmosfera sombria impartida pela tragédia reside nas profundezas do texto, o que deixa claro que uma nova era estava apenas começando. Num de seus maiores sucessos, As alegres comadres de Windsor, há um forte sentimento de tragédia. De mesmo modo, na comédia Medida por Medida, a tragicomédia é intensificada por uma tragédia composta, a do destino de sua heroína. Em muitos momentos catastróficos e trágicos, as situações cômicas se entrelaçam, e a salvação nos momentos finais não dissolve o brilho catastrófico e sombrio da desgraça, Como em Misura per misure (Marques Luiz and Macdonald Alden, 2018) [6].

11. Themes of Death and Loss

In tragedy, like comedy, death and loss form the very basis for the development of dramatic action. However, while comedies usually end with marriage and the renewal of life, tragedies end in death, often on a large scale. Furthermore, paltry deaths in comedy often seem to theatricalize what so tragically devastates the lives of larger-than-life tragic figures. This doubling creates a complex relationship between the genres across the Elizabethan divide surprisingly scribed by the playwright sometimes thought to have most firmly delineated them in his dedicatory epistle to Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, with respect to The Passionate Pilgrim: "The passion of a too forward peasant, another's comedy; of a too forward youth, his tragedy" (N Betts, 2016) [7]. Yet in producing his own virtuosic genres, this same playwright seemingly conflated and collapsed them. Shakespeare's Comedy of Errors appears as a comic retelling of Plautus's tragic Menaechmi, replete with a suicidal epilogue foreboding Hamlet's tragedy.

As a vehicle of genre, death broadens tragedy's dramatic scope while complicating acts of its spectatorship. It could even be said to lie at the very heart of tragedy in so far as it invites the most intimate engagement with its performance's efficacy in the shaping and sharing of passion, juxtaposing, as it were, personal with social death. These modes of death's enactment and engagement frame tragedy's interaction with comedy, complicating the latter's ability to contain and thereby remedy tragedy's dramatic throes, however much it would seem to do so. Comedies like Errors, As You Like It, or, if they ever did, then non-tragedies like Cymbeline pathologize and thus dramatize tragic death's interpersonal apathy and social disintegration, producing a countervening hysterical excess of life.

12. Fate and Misfortune

In this structure of framing comedy, exit and closure are carefully plotted. It is in the design of tragedy that the departures from classical precedent prove most marked. The indisputably tragic deaths in Hamlet, Othello, and Macbeth create a narrative dynamic at least comparable to the comic confusion and reconciliation of the Greek romances. Even Lear's 'coup de théâtre of apotheosis' is matched (Langley, 2013) by the comic 'severed heads rejoined' as the tragedy's shaping confluence is lost in unresolvable disjunction. Reconciling narrative agreements necessitate further considerations of genre-related distinctions in Shakespeare's earlier and later framing of tragic/reconciliation plots. Operating in a Renaissance mediacy between classical models and contemporary expectations, these distinctions reflect Shakespeare's emergent convergences of cultural historical, epistemological, and ontological concerns. Dante ultimately imagines tragedy without comedy and reconciliation in a hell whose 'very nature is…lost hope' (Aileen Mallery, 1990) [1], whereas Shakespeare's Hellios eternally grieves at Lear's 'poor fool' who 'sees…all' and yet 'is mad' (i.e., the 'pathetic fallacy' of nature's spectral bleating and thunder) only upon faith's loss and God's absence. Only the Fool persists in 'jests….that end in…nothing', and the tragedy's action ends 'like a giant's fall' under own Heaven devalued.

13. Summary of Findings

Tragedy and comedy have been judged opposing and contradictory genres ever since Aristotle established the founding principles of tragic drama in his Poetics. A comedy, in turn, with its mockery of the heroic and the tragic, its frivolousness and merriment, was held in an inferior position; an erroneous view that persisted in the Renaissance. Nevertheless, Shakespeare's output includes plays that stand between the two genres and cannot be categorically placed on either end of the tragedy-comedy spectrum. Such plays have been termed tragicomedies, romance comedies or bittersweet plays by different scholars at different times.

Similar to Shakespearean tragicomedies, Shakespearean romances are defined as plays marked by elements of tragedy but having a comic denouement. However, some claim tragedies such as Macbeth and Othello exhibit romantic

qualities while still being termed tragedies. Moreover, genre discrepancies and overlaps are inherent in many Shakespearean dramas beyond those usually categorized as tragicomedies or romances. Thus, attempts to confine any of Shakespeare's works - be they comedies, tragedies, histories or the hybrids thereof - to strict generic boundaries are elusive and futile (Laureen Lowe, 1999) [4]. Ingenuous in their intent, such undertakings fail to acknowledge one of Shakespeare's greatest accomplishments as a dramatist: genre flexibility and liberty. Shakespeare was not bound or preoccupied along the lines of genre divisions and restrictions that others were. This freedom allowed Shakespeare to skilfully experiment with genre and create plays that, while conforming to certain generic norms, at the same time transcended those very norms. Shakespeare's genius notwithstanding, dramatic genre restrictions in the Renaissance were taken very seriously by other playwrights.

14. Implications for Understanding Shakespeare's Works

An important implication of this exploration is that while Shakespeare's plays are often segregated and classified in order to examine them, it is vital to consider the active coexistence and interaction of different modes instead. In view of the intermingling of comic and tragic modes in Shakespeare's narrative works, it would also be wise to consider the different styles and modes of the epilogues to the plays, instead of erecting as many barriers and divisions as there are epilogues. While Shakespeare's plays are normally pigeon holed by genre, it is interesting to note that up until the early nineteenth century, theatrical companies generally promoted and performed Shakespeare's plays as a group and ensemble rather than as segregated and classifiable individual works. This grouping and classifiable works; or to put it in another way, an implication of clearly classifying Shakespeare's plays from "outside" is that such classifications can lead to obfuscating Shakespeare's intentions in "composing" them from a "unified" perspective or "bigger picture." Consideration of the problems of classification and tragicomedy as a genre sheds much-needed light on the intentions governing the cohesion of these classifiable but segregated works (Laureen Lowe, 1999) [4].

15. Conclusion

Like all geniuses, he never rested on his laurels but spent the last years of his life trying to break new ground. He experimented with tragicomedy, a form invented specifically to address the problem of what to do next after having done it all. He tried every combination of tragedy and comedy, hoping to find a winning formula, but in the end, it was the very vagueness of the genre that undid him. Shakespeare's plays offer a unique perspective on the interconnectedness of comedy and catastrophe. In both his comedies and tragedies, Shakespeare grapples with themes of love, loss, and the absurdity of the human condition. His ability to shift seamlessly between humor and tragedy speaks to the complexity of the human experience and highlights the fine line that separates joy from sorrow. Shakespeare doesn't abandon the comic view but repositions it. Rather than a genre, comedy becomes something closer to a state of mind, an understanding of life that implies a relativism of values (Laureen Lowe, 1999) [4]. This understanding is articulated through the character Feste, whose songs center on loss and the inevitable passage of time. In the end, Shakespeare depicts a world where the tragic, the comic, the absurd, and the sublime coexist.

Shakespeare's final plays explore the tension between tragedy and comedy. In a world turned upside down, everything is possible a reflection of Shakespeare's own circumstances. However, as Shakespeare tackled this delicate moment, questions about the nature of tragicomedy arose. The form seems too inclusive, accommodating everything from the absurd to the mediocre. While tragicomedy in the strict sense cannot be defined, it can be understood relatively, as a conjunction of two styles. Shakespeare's final plays are tragicomedies that extend beyond expectations for a convergence of the tragic and the comic. In a tragicomic world, different rules of coherence apply. The absurd is central to Shakespeare's comic perspective, but it is not approached in Beckett's manner. With the absurd comes the sublime, shaping comic representation. Comedy inevitably fails, as do the characters' attempts to comprehend the comic vision. In Shakespeare's tragicomedies, comic and tragic coexist.

References

1. Mallery MA. The Changing Face of Fortune in Six English Versions of the Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra [dissertation]. New York: City University of New York Graduate Center; 1990.
2. Langley E. The path to which wild error leads: A Lucretian Comedy of Errors. Textual Pract. 2014;28(6):921-940. doi:10.1080/0950236X.2013.835744.
3. Larner D. Passions for Justice: Fragmentation and Union in Tragedy, Farce, Comedy, and Tragi-Comedy. Place unknown: Publisher unknown; 2001.
4. Lowe JL. Tragicomedy: an Attempt at Classification Place unknown: Publisher unknown; 1999.
5. Navarro Martínez VLM. La tragedia a ojos de los cómicos: algunos ejemplos paradigmáticos de paratragedia. Place unknown: Publisher unknown; 2017.
6. Marques Luiz T, Macdonald Alden R. O uso do material cômico na tragédia de Shakespeare e seus contemporâneos [The use of comic material in the tragedy of Shakespeare and his contemporaries]. Place unknown: Publisher unknown; 2018.
7. Betts LN. The Performance of Melancholy: Understanding the Humours through Burton, Jonson, and Shakespeare [dissertation or book/thesis]. Place unknown: Publisher unknown; 2016

How to Cite This Article

Aboaltaboukq RMK. Humor and tragedy: Exploring the interconnectedness of comedy and catastrophe in Shakespeare's works. International Journal of Social Science Exceptional Research. 2026 Mar–Apr;5(2):101–105. doi:10.54660/IJSSER.2026.5.2.101-105.

Creative Commons (CC) License